UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,523	03/10/2004	Guijun Wang	7784-000719US	4532
	7590 12/03/200 CKEY & PIERCE, PLO	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 828		POLLACK, MELVIN H		
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2445	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/797,523	WANG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MELVIN H. POLLACK	2445				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Se</u>	entember 2008					
, <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.						
,— , , , — , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	—					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 September 2004</u> is/a	ire∶ a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec	ted to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	atent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: <u>see attached office action</u> .						

Application/Control Number: 10/797,523 Page 2

Art Unit: 2445

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. An analysis of the arguments is provided below.

- 2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the particular definition of "negotiation") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- 3. Examiner defines the term of "negotiating a contract" in light of Paras. 21-24 and 47-48 of the instant application, and in light of the broadest reasonable interpretation to one of ordinary skill in the art. Under this definition, one cannot see a difference between negotiation (Pp. 8-9) and of determining and allocating bandwidth and other resources based on priority and other aspects of a transaction. The application desires resources, the server decides what to dole out, and DeLima describes this interaction adequately. If applicant wishes to delve deeper into the functionality of negotiation, they may do so with proper citation of the specification.
- 4. Likewise, the examiner defines the term "self configurable resource (P. 9)" in light of Paras. 42-44 of the specification. Based on the definition, there seems to be no difference in functionality between DeLima and the instant application.
- 5. Therefore, the rejection is maintained for the reasons above, and is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/797,523 Page 3

Art Unit: 2445

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeLima et al. (7,213,071).
- 8. DeLima teaches a method and system (abstract) of providing real-time management of resources using a common management interface (col. 1, line 1 col. 7, line 15; col. 17, line 58 col. 19, line 5) in an enterprise environment (col. 7, lines 15-35) for use in both task and message events (col. 4, lines 5-15; col. 7, lines 35-55) for allocating resources (col. 1, lines 45-65) and performing prediction (col. 6, lines 25-30). Resources are allocated based on contract and policy, and are dynamically allocated based on continued interaction (col. 8, line 60 col. 13, line 55).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2445

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MELVIN H. POLLACK whose telephone number is (571)272-

3887. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. H. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2445

25 November 2008

/Larry D Donaghue/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454